



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/213,510	12/17/1998	PETER BRANDT	3557-US	6783

7590 03/12/2003

MARTIN A FARBER  
866 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA  
SUITE 473  
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUNG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/213,510

Applicant(s)  
Brandt et al.

Examiner  
Dung Nguyen

Art Unit  
2871



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 26, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, and 4-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, and 4-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2871

***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's amendment dated 11/26/2002 has been received and entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, as stated in the previous office action.

Regarding claim 16, as stated in the previous office action, the limitation of the front surface of the liquid crystal screen can be arranged in the same plane as the front surface of the dial plate (i.e., the dial assembly) is not supported by the original disclosure.

Applicants state that claim 16 defines the front surface of the display (the polarizing filter) is arranged in the same plane as a front surface of the dial assembly; and such limitation is believed to be free of rejection under 35 USC 112 (amendment, page 9). The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's viewpoint, and respectfully invited the applicant to review claim 16, lines 6-7 which recites the polarizing filter being on the front surface of the display (emphasis

Art Unit: 2871

added). Therefore, the front surface of the display in line 9 cannot be a front polarizing filter as asserted by Applicants.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 16 stand.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, as stated in the previous office action.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the front surface" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1-2, 4-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasco, US Patent No. 4,323,951, in view of Ogura et al., US Patent No. 5,915,822 and Abileah et al., US Patent No. 5,629,784, as stated in the previous office action.

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Applicants contend that neither Pasco nor Ogura disclose a dial plate with a film with dial markings as well as a front polarizing filter (amendment, pages 9 and 10). The Examiner agrees that Pasco and Ogura do not explicitly a dial plate with a film with

Art Unit: 2871

dial markings and a liquid crystal display (LCD) panel having a front polarizing filter; however, Pasco does disclose a light guide suitable for a dashboard panel (e.g., speedometer) as shown in figure 1. In other words, a screen (17) would have a dial marking thereon. In addition, it is a common practice in an LCD art forming a polarizing film in a front of an LCD panel as evidence from Abileah et al.. Therefore, the combination of Pasco, Ogura and Abileah et al. would include a dial marking, a front polarizing film arranged therewith a continuous surface as a single component as required in the Pasco's light guide.

Accordingly, the rejection of the above claims stand.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as stated above.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2871

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0423. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722.

Any information of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



TOANTON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DN  
03/07/2003